



Town of Lexington - FY 2018-FY 2022 Capital Improvement Projects

Project Name: Stone Building Analysis **Date:** 17-Oct-16
Project ID Number: 1032 **Revision Date:** 17-Oct-16
Submitted By: Carol Kowalski **Department:** Land Use, Health and Dev **Priority:** 0
First Year Submission? ☒ **Phone #:** 781-698-4561 **E-mail:** ckowalski@lexingtonma.gov

Description of Project:

The Town commissioned a report from Spencer Vogt in 2009 with recommendations for preserving and rehabilitating the Ellen Stone Building as a Lexington Lyceum, Heritage Center, and rotating exhibit space. This analysis would consider alternatives for addressing issues identified in the report and along with recommendations on how to program the space to realize the goals of achieving a totally accessible preserved building, including the front door, providing a focal point for East Lexington, and a way to keep secure the artifacts, art and documents on display in the first floor while the upper level is open and in use by the public.

Justification/Benefit:

The Stone Building is a historic and architectural treasure of the Town. It has been vacant since the branch library closed. Vacant historic buildings are vulnerable for a variety of reasons. Investment in the rehabilitation and reuse has already been made in the Spencer Vogt study. The building could allow the Historical Society and others to exhibit collections and contemporary work that links the Stone Building's historical significance to Lexington with the community's 21st vitality. The re-use of the preserved building will also contribute to Lexington's role as a tourist destination and regional draw for the visitor economy. The re-use of this magnificent building will also serve as a focal point for East Lexington, which has a large concentration of historic buildings.

Impact if not completed:

A vacant historic building is vulnerable to many threats. The remaining original features and historic fabric would have to be reconstructed if lost to fire, theft, vandalism or pests, which would be more costly than preserving and rehabilitating the building, and today's materials would be poor substitutes for the original historic features and historic fabric.

Timeframe:

This request contemplates 12-month study from the authorization to proceed, including input and stakeholder review.

Replace. Reg:

Years

Stakeholders:

Cary Memorial Library Trustees, Historical Society, Historical Commission, Historic Districts Commission, and others.

Operating Budget Impact:

Contract administration and project supervising by existing staff.

Cost Analysis:

Funding Source: ☐ Levy ☒ CPA ☐ Revolving ☐ State Aid ☐ Water ☐ Sewer ☐ Recreation ☐ Private ☐ Other

Capital Funding Request

1032	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	Totals
Site Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Design/Engineer	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,000
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Contingency	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Totals	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,000
CPA Amt. Req.	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Recurring Cost

\$0.00

Maintenance Cycle

0 Years

CPA Purpose
<input type="radio"/> Open Space
<input type="radio"/> Recreation
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Historic
<input type="radio"/> Housing

Basis of Cost Projection:

Spencer Vogt provided the cost estimate October 2016.